

Self-consistent mapping: Effect of local environment on formation of magnetic moment in α - $FeSi_2$.

V.S. Zhandun* and N.G. Zamkova, S.G. Ovchinnikov, and I.S. Sandalov
*Kirensky Institute of Physics, Federal Research Center "Krasnoyarsk Science Centre,
 Siberian Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences", 660036 Krasnoyarsk, Russia*

The Hohenberg-Kohn theorem establishes a basis for mapping of the exact energy functional to a model one provided that their charge densities coincide. We suggest here to use a mapping in a similar spirit: the parameters of the formulated multiorbital model should be determined from the requirement that the self-consistent charge and spin densities found from the *ab initio* and model calculations have to be as close to each other as possible. The analysis of the model allows for detailed understanding of the role played by different parameters of the model in the physics of interest. After finding the areas of interest in the phase diagram of the model we return to the *ab initio* calculations and check if the effects discovered are confirmed or not. Because of the last controlling step we call this approach as hybrid self-consistent mapping approach (HSCMA). As an example of the approach we present the study of the effect of silicon atoms substitution by the iron atoms and *vice versa* on the magnetic properties in the iron silicide $\alpha - FeSi_2$. The DFT+GGA calculations are mapped to the model with intraatomic Coulomb and exchange interactions, hoppings to nearest and next nearest atoms and exchange of the delocalized electrons between iron atoms; the magnetic moments on atoms and charge densities of the material are found self-consistently within the Hartree-Fock approximation.

We find that while the stoichiometric $\alpha - FeSi_2$ is nonmagnetic, the substitutions generate different magnetic structures. For example, the substitution of three *Si* atoms by the *Fe* atoms results in the ferrimagnetic structure whereas the substitution of four *Si* atoms by *Fe* atoms gives rise to either the nonmagnetic or the ferromagnetic state depending on the type of local environment of the substitutional *Fe* atoms. Besides, contrary to the commonly accepted statement that the destruction of the magnetic moment is controlled only by the number of *Fe - Si* nearest neighbors, we find that actually it is controlled by the *Fe - Fe next-nearest-neighbors'* hopping parameter. This finding led us to the counterintuitive conclusion: an *increase of Si concentration* in $Fe_{1-x}Si_{2+x}$ ordered alloys may lead to a ferromagnetism. This conclusion is confirmed by the calculation within GGA-to-DFT.

I. INTRODUCTION

The method of mapping of first-principle density functional theory (DFT) calculations to the effective Heisenberg model for theoretical study of the magnetic properties of solids was developed in the series of works [1]. The role played by the electronic subsystem in this approach is reduced to formation of the lowest-order pairwise effective exchange interaction of classical spins. In order to have an opportunity to use the well-developed many-body perturbation theory and to obtain the physical picture of the formation of the magnetic and, especially, the non-magnetic properties of the matter by the electronic subsystem one either have to use Hedin's GW approximation[2] or a detailed model which includes all atoms, their key orbitals and symmetry of the lattice in question, hopping parameters and Coulomb interactions. The GW approximation (even without the vertex corrections) is extremely time and computer-resources consuming. For this reason the route with more simple model Hamiltonians seems to be more efficient for highlighting the physics.

The construction of the hopping parameters for certain symmetries has been described by Slater and Koster[3].

Then, the phase diagram for the chosen model in the multidimensional space of these hopping parameters, Coulomb and exchange matrix elements can be constructed in a proper approximation. However, one point in this multi-parameter space corresponds to each real material, which can be described by such a model. A change of the external conditions for the material, like applying a pressure, temperature, or placing a film of the material on some substrate, will move this point from the initial position only slightly. Therefore, in order to be able to predict the behavior of real material, we have to know the material-in-question coordinates in the parameter space with good accuracy. Unfortunately, a unique receipt how to find the position of the material in the model parameter space does not exist. Here we suggest the following way to resolve this difficulty. Since the DFT-based calculations usually give a reasonably good description of metals and produce corresponding self-consistent spin- and charge densities, we can speculate in the DFT spirit: we use the requirement that the system with a model Hamiltonian has the spin- and charge densities as close as possible (ideally, the same) to the one obtained within the first-principle calculations for finding the parameters of the model. Then, having obtained some prediction within the model calculations we return to the first-principle ones in order to check the validity of the model prediction. This is an essence of the

* jvc@iph.krasn.ru; Corresponding author

suggested here *hybrid self-consistent mapping approach* (HSCMA). It may seem that such approach should work only within the validity domain of the chosen approximation for the DFT (in our case GGA-to-DFT). However, the largest contribution to the energy of the system and formation of the local charge density $\rho_{DFT}(r)$ comes from the Hartree part of interaction, which is treated in DFT pretty well. That is why we want to start *at least* from the point in the model parameter space which provides $\rho_{model}(r)$ close to $\rho_{DFT}(r)$. Further the model with these parameters can be used for description of the phenomena beyond reach of DFT. Then the question arises why we want that the *self-consistent* model and DFT charge densities (magnetic moments) have to be close to each other? The matter is that we want to know the *bare* parameters of the model in order to be able to use the diagrammatic methods for dressing them and to avoid double counting. The most difficult question here is to find an approximation for the model calculation which would correspond to the one used in DFT. It clear, however, that the constraints in the accuracy of both methods allow to require a rough correspondence of charge densities. Indeed, on the one hand, in the DFT we use the exchange-correlation potential with restricted and, often, unknown validity domain (moreover, it is known that the calculations within the same approximation, but different packages, produce non-coinciding results). On the other hand, the model has to contain much smaller number of the interactions and hopping parameters (otherwise we will come to GW type of description at least). In spite of this uncertainty at the initial step this approach is attractive because it does not contain any fitting parameters, which should be taken from experiment. From this point of view it should be considered as first-principle approach. We have chosen to treat the model within the Hartree-Fock approximation.

The HSCMA is applied here for the analysis of the magnetic properties of $\alpha - FeSi_2$ -based ordered alloys.

The growth of *Fe*-silicides on silicon has been widely studied in recent years because, depending on their phase, crystal structure and composition, they can be semiconducting, metallic and/or ferromagnetic, and hence offer a large variety of potential applications when integrated into silicon-based devices [4]-[6]. To this day, several *Fe*-silicide structures have been reported. At the *Fe*-rich side of the binary phase diagram, metallic as well as ferromagnetic Fe_5Si_3 and Fe_3Si (DO_3 structure) [7, 8] have already been established as key materials for spintronics [8, 9]. The *Si*-rich side of the phase diagram contains several variants of a disilicide stoichiometric compound, such as the high-temperature tetragonal metallic $\alpha - FeSi_2$ phase [11], with applications as an electrode or an interconnect material [12, 13], and the orthorhombic semiconducting $\beta - FeSi_2$ phase [14], which due to its direct band gap is an interesting candidate for thermoelectric, photovoltaic and optoelectronic devices [15]. While room-temperature stable β -phase is well-studied, tetragonal α -phase do not attract great interest

until recently. This is due to this phase is metastable and exist only at temperatures above $950^\circ C$ [11]. However, the iron silicides, which do not exist in bulk, can be stabilized as films. In Refs. [12],[16]-[19] a successful fabrication of thin films $\alpha - FeSi_2$ was reported. Also, while the magnetic order is not observed in bulk stoichiometric disilicide $\alpha - FeSi_2$, ferromagnetism was found [19] in the metastable phase $\alpha - FeSi_2$, which was stabilized in epitaxial-film grown on the silicon substrate. The authors of Refs. [13], [20] reported that the magnetic moments on *Fe* atoms $\mu = 1.8\mu_B$ [13] and $\mu = 3.3\mu_B$ [20] in $\alpha - FeSi_2$ nanoislands and nano-stripes on *Si* (111) substrate arise. These experimental achievements have good perspective for the integration of the *FeSi* -based magnetic devices into silicon technology, and, therefore, demands for the detailed understanding of the physics of the magnetic moment formation in these compounds.

Traditionally, the appearance of the magnetic structure in *Fe-Si* alloys is related to the increase of the concentration of *Fe* atoms. So, the unusual ferromagnetism in epitaxial-film form $\alpha - FeSi_2$ authors [19] explain by the appearance of substitutional *Fe* atoms on *Si* sublattice. According to the *ab initio* calculation in the framework of *Coherent Potential Approximation* (CPA) performed in [19] the ferromagnetism in thin films $\alpha - FeSi_2$ appears with the substitution of small percent of silicon atoms by the iron atoms. Particularly, when the concentration of substitution *Fe* atoms reaches 3.3%, these *Fe* atoms acquire magnetic moment $\mu = 2.4\mu_B$. Similar explanation of anomalously high total magnetic moment was suggested also by the authors of Refs. [13], [20]. The decrease of the magnetic moments of *Fe* atoms with the increase of the *Si* concentration was observed experimentally in the iron silicides Fe_xSi_{1+x} and discussed in the framework of the phenomenological local environment models [21]-[23]. It was noticed, that the changing of magnetic moment of *Fe* atom in iron silicides Fe_xSi_{1+x} , rather depends on the number of *Si* atoms in the nearest local environment of iron and not on the concentration of *Si* atoms. In our work [24] the mechanism of magnetic moment formation in Fe_3Si is analysed in the framework of the multiorbital model, where it is shown that the neighboring *Fe* atoms along crystallographic axes as well as *Si* atoms in the first coordination sphere play the crucial role in the destruction of the *Fe* magnetic moments. Namely, the increase of the number of such *Fe* neighbors leads to the decrease of the *Fe* magnetic moment. Iron atoms in $\alpha - FeSi_2$ have only silicon atoms as the nearest neighbors and from the traditional point of view [21]-[23] it is naturally to assume that the absence of the magnetism in this silicide is caused by the nearest silicon environment. However, the specific feature of the $\alpha - FeSi_2$ structure is the presence of the alternating *Fe* and *Si* planes, which are perpendicular to the tetragonal axis of the cell (Fig.1a). In such plane *Fe* atoms are surrounded only by *Fe* atoms arranged along the crystallographic axes. Our analysis [24] prompts that such mutual arrangement of *Fe* atoms should results in the

magnetic moment destruction. The target of this work is to investigate the influence of local environment on the formation of the magnetic moments on iron atoms in the silicide $\alpha - FeSi_2$, its ordered Fe - rich solid solutions with substitutional Fe atoms $Fe_{1+x}Si_{2-x}$ and Si - rich one with substitutional Si atoms, $Fe_{1-x}Si_{2+x}$. Particularly, we will address the question about the role, played by second neighbors of Fe ions in the physics of magnetic moment formation.

The paper is organized as follow. In Sec.II we provide the details of *ab initio* and model calculations. The results of the *ab initio* calculations of $\alpha - FeSi_2$ and its Fe -rich alloys are given in Sec. IIIA. The results of the model calculations of $\alpha - FeSi_2$ and its Fe -rich alloys and the dependence of magnetic moments on the hopping matrix elements are presented in Sec. IIIB. The results of the *ab initio* investigation of Si -rich alloys of $\alpha - FeSi_2$ are described in Sec. IIIC. Sec.IV contains the summary of the obtained results and conclusions.

II. HSCMA: THE HYBRID AB INITIO AND MODEL CALCULATION METHOD

In this work we combine the *ab initio* calculations with the model one. We use the following scheme. First we perform the calculation of electronic and magnetic properties of the compound of interest within the framework of *DFT-GGA* for different way of silicon atoms substitution by iron atoms taking into account the relaxation of atomic positions. Then we perform mapping the *DFT-GGA* results to the multiorbital model, suggested in Ref.[24]. The guiding argument for the formulation of the

model are: the model should 1) contain as little as possible parameters; 2) contain the specific information about the compound in question, *i.e.*, contain proper number of orbitals and electrons, and to possess the symmetry of the corresponding crystal structure, and 3) contain main interactions, reflecting our understanding of the underlying physics. At last, we perform the mapping following the *DFT* ideology: we find the parameters of the model from fitting the its self-consistent charge density to the one, obtained in *the ab initio* calculations. The latter step distinguishes our approach from other ones [1, 25, 26]. Here we briefly outline the model Hamiltonian, the details of model calculation are described in [24]. We include into the Hamiltonian of our model set of interactions between the d -electrons of Fe ($5d$ -orbitals per spin) following Kanamori [27]. The structure contains neighboring Fe ions, for this reason the interatomic direct d - d -exchange and d - d -hopping are included too. The Si p -electrons ($3p$ -orbitals per spin) are modeled by atomic levels and interatomic hoppings. Both subsystems are connected by $d - p$ -hoppings. Thus, the Hamiltonian of the model is:

$$H = H^{Fe} + H_{J'}^{Fe-Fe} + H_0^{Si} + H_{hop}, \quad (1)$$

where

$$H^{Fe} = H_0^{Fe} + H_K^{Fe}$$

$$H_0^{Fe} = \sum \varepsilon_0^{Fe} \hat{n}_{nm\sigma}^d;$$

$$H_0^{Si} = \sum \varepsilon_0^{Si} \hat{n}_{nm\sigma}^p;$$

and the Kanamori's part of the Hamiltonian

$$\begin{aligned} H_K^{Fe} &= \frac{U}{2} \sum \hat{n}_{nm\sigma}^d \hat{n}_{nm\bar{\sigma}}^d + \left(U' - \frac{1}{2}J \right) \sum \hat{n}_{nm}^d \hat{n}_{nm'}^d (1 - \delta_{mm'}) - \frac{1}{2}J \sum \hat{s}_{nm}^d \hat{s}_{nm'}^d; \\ H_{J'}^{Fe-Fe} &= -\frac{1}{2}J' \sum \hat{s}_{nm}^d \hat{s}_{n'm'}^d; \\ H_{hop} &= \sum T_{n,n'}^{mm'} p_{nm\sigma}^\dagger p_{n'm'\sigma} + \sum t_{n,n'}^{mm'} d_{nm\sigma}^\dagger d_{n'm'\sigma} + \sum \left[(t')_{n,n'}^{mm'} d_{nm\sigma}^\dagger p_{n'm'\sigma} + H.c. \right]; \\ \hat{n}_{nm\sigma}^d &\equiv d_{nm\sigma}^\dagger d_{nm\sigma}; \quad \hat{n}_{nm}^d = \hat{n}_{nm\uparrow}^d + \hat{n}_{nm\downarrow}^d; \quad \hat{s}_{nm}^d \equiv \sigma_{\alpha\gamma} d_{nm\alpha}^\dagger d_{nm\gamma}; \quad \hat{n}_{nm\sigma}^p \equiv p_{nm\sigma}^\dagger p_{nm\sigma}. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Here $p_{nm\sigma}^\dagger (p_{nm\sigma})$ and $d_{nm\sigma}^\dagger (d_{nm\sigma})$ are the creation (annihilation) operators of p -electrons on Si - and d -electrons on Fe -ions; n is complex lattice index, (site, basis); m labels the orbitals; σ is spin projection index; $\sigma_{\alpha\gamma}$ are the Pauli matrices; $U, U' = U - 2J$ and J are the intraatomic Kanamori parameters; J' is the parameter of the intersite exchange between nearest Fe atoms. At last, $T_{n,n'}^{mm'}$, $t_{n,n'}^{mm'}$ $(t')_{n,n'}^{mm'}$ are hopping integrals between $Si-Si$, $Fe-Fe$ and $Fe-Si$ atoms, correspondingly. The

dependences of hopping integrals $T_{n,n'}^{mm'}$, $t_{n,n'}^{mm'}$ $(t')_{n,n'}^{mm'}$ of $\mathbf{k}$ were obtained from the Slater and Koster atomic orbital scheme [3] in the two-center approximation using basic set consisting of five $3d$ orbitals for each spin on each Fe and three $3p$ orbital for each spin on each Si . In this two-centre approximation the hopping integrals depend on the distance $\mathbf{R} = (l\mathbf{x} + m\mathbf{y} + n\mathbf{z})$ between the two atoms, where $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}$ are the unit vectors along cubic axis and l, m, n are direction cosines. Then, within the two-center approximation, the hopping

integrals are expressed in terms of Slater – Koster parameters $t_\sigma = (dd\sigma)$, $t_\pi = (dd\pi)$ and $t_\delta = (dd\delta)$ for $Fe-Fe$ hopping, $t_\sigma = (pd\sigma)$, $t_\pi = (pd\pi)$ for $Fe-Si$ and $t_\sigma = (pp\sigma)$, $t_\pi = (pp\pi)$ for $Si-Si$ hoppings (σ, π, δ specifies the components of the angular momentum relative to the direction $\mathbf{R}$). Their $\mathbf{k}$ -dependence are given by the functions $\gamma_\sigma(\mathbf{k})$, $\gamma_\pi(\mathbf{k})$ and $\gamma_\delta(\mathbf{k})$, where $\gamma(\mathbf{k}) = \sum_{\mathbf{R}} e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}}$. The expressions for hopping integrals can be obtained in Table I from [3]. For example, $t_{Fe-Fe}^{xy,xy}(\mathbf{k}) = 2t_\pi [\cos(R_x k_x) + \cos(R_y k_y)] + 2t_\delta \cos(R_z k_z)$, etc. The number of points in the Brillouin zone was taken 1000. Monkhorst-Pack scheme [28] was used for generation of the $\mathbf{k}$ -mesh. The model is solved within the Hartree-Fock approximation (HFA). The band structure arises due to hopping parameters, which connect nearest neighbors (NN) and next NN (NNN) sites. The calculations were performed for three initial states: ferromagnetic (FM), antiferromagnetic (AFM) and paramagnetic (PM) states. After achieving self-consistency the state with minimal total energy was chosen. The last step was done with the help of the Galitsky-Migdal formula for total energy ((10) in [24]), which we adopted for our model.

All *ab initio* calculations presented in this paper have been performed using the *Vienna ab initio simulation package* (VASP) [29] with projector augmented wave (PAW) pseudopotentials [30]. The valence electron configurations $3d^6 4s^2$ are taken for Fe atoms and $3s^2 3p^2$ for Si atoms. The calculations is based on the density functional theory where the exchange-correlation functional is chosen within the Perdew-Burke-Ernzerhoff (PBE) parametrization [31] and the generalized gradient approximation (GGA) has been used. Throughout all calculations, the plane-wave cutoff energy is 500eV, and Gauss broadening with smearing 0.05eV is used. The Brillouin-zone integration is performed on the grid Monkhorst-Pack [28] special points $8 \times 8 \times 6$. The optimized lattice parameters and atom's coordinates were obtained by minimizing the full energy.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. *Ab initio* calculations

Stoichiometric compound $\alpha - FeSi_2$ has tetragonal space symmetry group $P4/mmm$ with one formula unit per cell. The structure is shown in Fig.1a. The compound is nonmagnetic metal with lattice parameters from our *ab initio* calculations $a = 2.70\text{\AA}$, $c = 5.13\text{\AA}$ that are in a good agreement with experimental values [32]. The structure of $\alpha - FeSi_2$ consists of alternating planes of iron and silicon atoms $Fe-Si-Si-Fe$, which are perpendicular to the tetragonal axis of the cell. Iron atoms are surrounded by 8 silicon atoms ($R_{Fe-Si} = 2.36\text{\AA}$) located in the corners of slightly distorted in [001] direction cube, the next nearest neighbors (NNN) of iron atoms are Fe atoms arranged along crystallographic axes x and y , forming the iron plane ($R_{Fe-Fe} = 2.70\text{\AA}$). The full den-




Figure 1. (Color online) Left panel: the structure of $\alpha - FeSi_2$; Si atoms are shown by blue balls, Fe atoms – by grey balls. Right panel: partial density of electronic states (pDOS) of Fe atoms; black line shows t_{2g} states, red line shows e_g states. Zero on the energy axis is chosen at the Fermi energy.

sity of states of $\alpha - FeSi_2$ was calculated in the works [33]-[35] and in our recent work [36], thus, in the present paper we give only partial spin-projected density (pDOS) of $Fe d$ - electron states in Fig.1b. As seen, both t_{2g} and e_g electrons are delocalized in a wide energy range and a magnetism is absent.






However, as was mentioned in Introduction, several recent studies [13, 19, 20] discovered that a ferromagnetic state arises in the films of $\alpha - FeSi_2$. The explanation of the emergence of the magnetic structure, suggested in these works, is within the commonly accepted opinion, that the magnetism arises due to an increase of Fe concentration in the material. The used theoretical approaches, CPA in the Ref. [19] and phenomenological local environment models in Refs [13, 20], take into account, however, only a part of the local environment effects because full account of them is beyond the reach of the standard CPA methods by construction, whereas the local environment models [21, 22] take into account the nearest environment only. In Ref.[24] we found that the next nearest environment (NNN) plays a crucial role in the magnetic moment formation. This motivates us to include the NNN local environment effects into study of the magnetic properties of Fe - rich ordered alloys both in the framework of DFT calculations and subsequent analysis in the suggested multiorbital model too. The different local environment of iron atoms was set by the different spatial arrangement and number of substitutional Fe atoms in the ordered alloys $Fe_{1+x}Si_{2-x}$. In this part of paper we presented the results of our *ab initio* calculations of some of ordered alloys $Fe_{1+x}Si_{2-x}$. We used for the calculations the supercell $2a \times 2a \times c$, where a and c – the lattice parameters of stoichiometric $\alpha - FeSi_2$.

The ordered alloys considered in the present work are shown in Table I. Alloys **A** and **B** contain one and three substitutional Fe atoms at the Si sites in the Si -planes, correspondingly. In the last three alloys **C**, **D**, **E** four Si atoms were replaced by Fe atoms in different ways: in the

plane perpendicular to c axis (**C**), in the plane parallel to c axis (**D**) and chess-mate replacement (**E**). The lattice parameters and calculated magnetic moments on the host iron atoms in Fe sublattice of $\alpha - FeSi_2$ (Fe_0) and on the substitutional iron atoms (Fe_I and Fe_{II}) obtained

after full optimization of geometry are given in Table I. The geometry optimization results in the elongation of all cells along c axis and to the compression in the (ab) plane which are most pronounced for the **C** and **E** alloys.

Table I. (*Color online*) The structures of some of ordered alloys, the optimized lattice parameters and the calculated magnetic moments; the colors encode: Si atoms by blue, host Fe_0 atoms by grey, the substitutional Fe_I and Fe_{II} atoms by black and green, correspondingly.

A	B	C	D	E
				
$a=b=5.37 \text{ \AA}$ $c=5.22 \text{ \AA}$ $\mu(Fe_0)=0.2 \mu_B$ $\mu(Fe_I)=2.7 \mu_B$	$a=b=5.23 \text{ \AA}$ $c=5.37 \text{ \AA}$ $\mu(Fe_0)=0.5 \mu_B$ $\mu(Fe_I)=2.6 \mu_B$ $\mu(Fe_{II})=-2.1 \mu_B$	$a=b=5.05 \text{ \AA}$ $c=5.22 \text{ \AA}$ $\mu(Fe_0)=0.0 \mu_B$ $\mu(Fe_I)=0.0 \mu_B$	$a=5.15 \text{ \AA}$ $b=5.37 \text{ \AA}$ $c=5.37 \text{ \AA}$ $\mu(Fe_0)=1.5 \mu_B$ $\mu(Fe_I)=2.5 \mu_B$	$a=b=4.80 \text{ \AA}$ $c=6.13 \text{ \AA}$ $\mu(Fe_0)=2.0 \mu_B$ $\mu(Fe_I)=1.3 \mu_B$

The substitution of one Si atom by iron (**A**) results in the appearance of the large magnetic moments ($\mu(Fe_I) = 2.7 \mu_B$) on the substitutional Fe_I atom. Although the alloy **A** is ordered the obtained result is coincides with the result obtained in CPA [19] for a random alloy. The value of the magnetic moment and pDOS on the substitutional Fe atom are in a good agreement with the ones from Ref.[19]. The general feature of both DOS is the sharp peak at the energy $\sim -3\text{eV}$, which originates from the minority t_{2g} state of d -electrons (Fig. 2).

A further increase of substitutional Fe concentration leads to the non-trivial results that clearly illustrate the dependence of Fe magnetic moments on the local environment. As seen from the Table I, the substitution of three Si atoms by Fe ones (alloy **B**) results in the appearance of the *ferrimagnetic* state: the substitutional Fe_I and Fe_{II} atoms become inequivalent: they acquire large magnetic moments, which are not equal to each other, and directed into *opposite* directions. The absolute values of magnetic moments are close to the ones in the alloy **A**. The alloy **B** presents only one of possible ways to order three substitutional Fe atoms in the supercell. Other nonequivalent ordering of the substitutional Fe atoms are shown in Table II. Our *ab initio* calculations show that the type of the magnetic structure, ferrimagnetic or ferromagnetic, is determined by the spatial arrangement of substitutional Fe atoms. Indeed, the first two alloys in Table II are ferrimagnetic, and the last three

are ferromagnetic. The same dependence of the iron magnetic moments on the spatial arrangement (and hence on the the local environment) arises for the alloys with four substitutional Fe atoms on Si sites (**C**, **D**, **E** in Table I). The alloy **C** and $\alpha - FeSi_2$ are non-magnetic, while the magnetic moments in the alloys **D** and **E** appear on the substitutional Fe_I and on the host Fe_0 atoms. The pDOSes of substitutional Fe_I in alloys **B**, **D**, **E** are similar to ones in alloy **A**, pDOS of Fe_{II} in alloy **B** atom is mirror-symmetric to pDOS of Fe_I . Notice that the t_{2g} states form peak in pDOS of substitutional Fe_I atom when the latter has magnetic moment while the pDOS of Fe_I d -electrons in the non-magnetic alloy **C** is similar to the one for the Fe atom in $\alpha - FeSi_2$ (Fig. 1b): t_{2g} and e_g electron states are delocalized in the wide energy range.

Thus, our *ab initio* calculations confirm only part of the conclusions, derived from the local environment models [21, 22]: the ferromagnetism arises with an increase of the Fe concentration indeed, but the types of the magnetic structure of the ordered $Fe_{1+x}Si_{2-x}$ alloys, which we obtain, are essentially different even at the same concentration of substitutional Fe atoms (Table I and Table II): the magnetic moments on Fe atoms are determined by the composition and the configuration of its local environment. These findings motivate us to investigate the role played by the different local environment on the magnetic moments formation in $Fe - Si$ alloys more carefully




Figure 2. (Color online) pDOS for host Fe_0 (left) and substitutional Fe_I (right) in the alloy **A**. Black line shows t_{2g} states, red line shows e_g states. Zero on the energy axis is the Fermi energy.

Table II. (Color online) The ordered alloys with three substitutional Fe atom at the Si sites. Si atoms are shown by blue balls, host Fe_0 by grey, substitutional Fe_I and Fe_{II} atoms are shown by black and green balls, correspondingly.

$\mu(Fe_0), \mu_B$	0.5	0.3	0.8	1.0	1.0
$\mu(Fe_I), \mu_B$	2.6	2.0	2.6	2.4	2.6
$\mu(Fe_{II}), \mu_B$	-2.4	-2.0	2.3	2.2	2.3
Lattice parameter, Å	$a=b=5.23$ $c=5.37$	$a=5.12$ $b=5.23$ $c=5.37$	$a=5.23$ $b=5.37$ $c=5.33$	$a=b=5.18$ $c=5.50$	$a=b=5.27$ $c=5.44$

B. The model calculations

In this subsection we describe the results of model calculations for the stoichiometric $\alpha - FeSi_2$ and its ordered Fe -rich alloys $Fe_{1+x}Si_{2-x}$ (**B**, **C** and **D** in Table I). In all model calculations we have used the following parameters (see Sec.II): Hubbard $U = 1$, *i.e.* all other parameters are given in units of U ; $J = 0.4$, $J' = 0.05$, $\varepsilon_{Si} = 6$, $\varepsilon_{Fe} = 0$. In the general case there are five hopping parameters: t_1 ($Fe-Fe$) and t_2 ($Fe-Si$) between the nearest neighbors (NN); t_3 ($Fe-Fe$), t_4 ($Fe-Si$) between next-nearest neighbors (NNN), and t_5 for $Si-Si$ hoppings. The relation $t_\pi = \frac{1}{3}t_\sigma$ for NN and $t_\pi = \frac{1}{2}t_\sigma$ for NNN was kept in all model calculations; for this reason further everywhere we will use $t_\sigma \equiv t$. The values for these hopping parameters are found from the requirement that after achieving self-consistency in both the model and the *ab initio* calculations (GGA), the d -DOS and magnetic moments on Fe atoms have to be as close to each other as possible.

in the framework of the multiorbital model suggested in [24] and briefly outlined in Sec. II. As was pointed out in [24] the crucial role in the magnetic structure formation in iron silicides is played by both nearest and *next*-nearest local environment. Both are taken into account in a model calculations.

The best fit of the model magnetic moments and DOS to the *ab initio* ones can be achieved only when the hopping integrals are positive for the NN and negative for NNN. Along all model calculations we used equilibrium lattice parameter, obtained from the *ab initio* calculation (see Table I). We also take into account that the values of hopping integrals should correlate with the distance between neighbors in all ordered alloys and in $\alpha - FeSi_2$. The values of hopping parameters which provide the best fit are shown in the Table III.

1. $\alpha - FeSi_2$

We begin with the stoichiometric $\alpha - FeSi_2$ (Fig. 1a). It has the tetragonal lattice with the space group $P4/m\bar{m}$. Each of Fe atom in the $\alpha - FeSi_2$ has only Si atoms in the nearest local environment and only Fe atoms as the second neighbors, therefore, there are three hop-

Table III. The distances d (Å) between nearest neighbors (NN) and next-nearest neighbors (NNN) and the values of hopping integrals t , which provide the best fit of the model charge densities to GGA-DFT ones.

	$\alpha - FeSi_2$		B		C		D	
	d	t	d	t	d	t	d	t
Fe-Si (NN)	2.36	1.0	2.38	0.95	2.37	1.0	2.39	0.95
Fe-Fe (NN)	-	-	2.40	0.9	2.44	0.85	2.43	0.85
Fe-Si (NNN)	-	-	2.62	-0.55	2.24	-0.8	2.56	-0.45
Fe-Fe (NNN)	2.70	-0.65	2.60	-0.70	2.53	-0.75	2.56	-0.72
							2.78	-0.60
Si-Si (NN)	2.34	2.0	2.39	2.0	2.53	1.5	2.41	2.0
Si-Si (NNN)	2.80	1.0	2.61	1.5	-	-	2.78	1.0





Figure 3. (*Color online*) Top panel: Nearest and next-nearest neighbors of Fe_0 with corresponding hopping integrals (Fe and Si atoms are shown by grey and blue balls correspondingly) and the $t_2 - t_3$ -map of magnetic moments; the blue lines show the values of hopping integrals t_2 and t_3 from Table IV. Bottom panel: Model pDOS for hopping integral $t_3 = 0.0$ (left) and $t_3 = -0.65$ (right). Hopping integral $t_2 = 1.0$

pings integrals: between NN $Fe - Si$ (t_2), between NNN $Fe - Fe$ (t_3) and between $Si - Si$ (t_5). These parameters were used for fitting the model d -DOS and the magnetic moments on Fe atoms to the *ab initio* ones. The values of t_2 , t_3 and t_5 parameters which provide the best fitting are shown in the Table III. The model and GGA Fe d - population numbers for stoichiometric $\alpha - FeSi_2$ and corresponding partial DOS of Fe d -electrons are compared in Table IV. The accuracy of the statement that the model reflects the properties of real compounds and qualitatively the features of *ab initio* pDOS at this set of parameters is seen from the Table IV.

In order to understand the effect of NN and NNN neighbors in the local environment on the magnetic moment (MM) formation we calculated the dependence of the MMs on the hopping integrals t_2 (NN $Fe - Si$) and

Table IV. The comparison of orbital population numbers ($n_{\uparrow}^d$, $n_{\downarrow}^d$), magnetic moments (μ) and the number of electrons (N_{el}) for $\alpha - FeSi_2$ in the model with GGA-DFT ones. The *ab initio* (blue lines) and the model (black lines) pDOS of Fe d -electrons (left: t_{2g} -electrons, right: e_g -electrons) in $\alpha - FeSi_2$ are compared in the figure under the Table..

	VASP			Model		
	$n_{\uparrow}^d$	$n_{\downarrow}^d$		$n_{\uparrow}^d$	$n_{\downarrow}^d$	
d_{xy}	0.77	0.76	$\mu = 0.1\mu_B$	0.67	0.66	$\mu = 0.2\mu$
d_{xz}	0.72	0.71	$N_{el} = 6.6$	0.70	0.68	$N_{el} = 6.6$
d_{yz}	0.72	0.71		0.79	0.68	
$d_{x^2-y^2}$	0.58	0.55		0.63	0.61	
d_{z^2}	0.67	0.63		0.70	0.60	



t_3 (NNN $Fe - Fe$). The map of the magnetic moment dependences on the hopping integrals t_2 and t_3 is shown in the top panel of Fig. 3. As seen the crucial role in the MM formation is played by hoppings between NNN $Fe - Fe$ (t_3). Indeed, with $|t_3| > 0.6$ the experimentally existing nonmagnetic state is stable, a decrease of $|t_3|$ leads to the transition into ferromagnetic state. Furthermore, the boundaries between region with magnetic states and non magnetic ones are very sharp (Fig. 3, top panel): the MM decreases till zero very fast as a function of hopping t_3 between iron atoms. The hopping between NN $Fe - Si$ (t_2) has effect only on the magnitude of the MM in the ferromagnetic region. The mechanism of ferromagnetism destruction with hopping t_3 is clearly seen from the bottom panel of Fig. 3. Switching off the hopping between NNN $Fe - Fe$ ($t_3 = 0$) makes the d -bands atom-like with the slight smearing. An increase of the t_3 hopping leads to a delocalization of these atom-like d -bands and destruction the magnetism. Hence, an increase of the distance between NNN (or, a decrease the hopping integral t_3) would results in the transition from nonmagnetic phase to magnetic one. This conclusion from the analysis of the model is confirmed by the *ab initio* calculation: the increase of the lattice parameters a and b of $\alpha - FeSi_2$ (or the distance NNN $Fe - Fe$) by 7% ($a = b = 2.9\text{\AA}$, $c = 5.13\text{\AA}$) causes formation of MMs $\mu = 0.6\mu_B$ on the Fe atoms. Thus, it is rather the hopping integral between the NNN $Fe - Fe$ atoms, not the NN $Fe - Si$ hopping, determines the existence of magnetic or non-magnetic state in $\alpha - FeSi_2$, because the NN of Fe atom consist of Si atoms in the both cases.




Figure 4. (Color online) Alloy **C** and **D**. *Top panel:* NN and NNN environment of iron atoms. *Si* atoms are shown by blue balls, grey and black balls stand for Fe_0 and substitutional Fe_I atoms, correspondingly. *Middle panel:* Dependence of the MMs on hopping integrals t_1 and t_2 (hopping integrals t_3 and t_4 are switch on). *Bottom panel:* Dependence of MMs on hopping integrals t_1 and t_2 (hopping integrals t_3 and t_4 are switch off). Blue lines show the values of hopping integrals $t_1 = 0.9$ and $t_2 = 1.0$ for alloy **C** and $t_1 = 0.85$ and $t_2 = 0.95$ for alloy **D** (Table III); these values provide the best fitting to the *ab initio* charge density.

2. Fe-rich alloys

To emphasize the importance of the NNN in the MM formation on iron atoms we consider the alloys **C** and **D** from Table I. These alloys reveal essentially different magnetic behavior at the same concentration but different spatial arrangements of the substitutional Fe atoms.

As it follows from *ab initio* calculation, the ordered alloy **D** reveals ferromagnetism, whereas the alloy **C** remains nonmagnetic (Table I). These ordered alloys have two nonequivalent Fe atoms: Fe_0 is the host iron atom in the iron sublattice of $\alpha - FeSi_2$ and Fe_I is the substitutional Fe atoms in the Si sublattice. Different spatial arrangement of the substitutional Fe atoms results in the different environment of the host and substitutional Fe atoms in alloys **D** and **C**. These environments are shown in Fig. 4 (top panel). There is the important difference in the NNN environment of Fe_0 and Fe_I in **C** and **D**

alloys. In the **C** alloy both Fe_0 and Fe_I atoms have four Fe atoms along crystallographic axes **a** and **b** as NNN at the same distances $R = 2.53\text{\AA}$ (Table III). The host Fe_0 in the alloy **D** also has four NNN Fe atoms, but at different distances: two Fe neighbors along axis **a** with the distance $R = 2.56\text{\AA}$ and two ones along axis **b** with $R = 2.78\text{\AA}$. These unequal distances arise due to the different symmetry of crystal lattices: the **C** lattice is tetragonal with the space group $P4mm$, while the **D** one is orthorhombic with space group $Pmmm$. Thus, the distortions of the underlying tetragonal lattice of $\alpha - FeSi_2$

arising in these alloys are different. Notice, that the distances between the NN $Fe - Si$ and the NN $Fe - Fe$ in both alloys are the same. Besides, the atom Fe_I has only two NNN Fe atoms at the distance $R = 2.78\text{\AA}$ in the alloy **D**. This distance is larger than the corresponding one in the alloy **C**. Therefore, we are forced to introduce in the alloy **D** two hopping integrals for the short t_3^a and long t_3^b distances between NNN $Fe - Fe$, while only one hopping integral t_3 is required for the description of the alloy **C**. The values of hopping integrals providing the best fitting to the *ab initio* calculation are given in Table III. The Hartree-Fock self-consistent MMs generated by the model at these values of hopping parameters are $\mu^{mod}(Fe_0) = \mu^{mod}(Fe_I) = 0$ in alloy **C** and $\mu^{mod}(Fe_0) = 1.4\mu_B$, $\mu^{mod}(Fe_I) = 2.5\mu_B$ in alloy **D**.

Let us compare the dependences of the Fe magnetic moments on the NN hopping integral t_1 and t_2 at fixed values of NNN hopping integral t_3 and t_4 , shown at the middle panel of Fig. 4. The range of the magnetic moments existence on both Fe_0 and Fe_I atoms in the alloy **D** is restricted by the values of $|t_1| < 1$. The magnetic state with moments close to *ab initio* values ($\mu(Fe_0) = 1.5\mu_B$, $\mu(Fe_I) = 2.5\mu_B$) is on the narrow boundary between ferro- and paramagnetic phases. In the alloy **C** the nonmagnetic state is stable in all range of the hoppings between NN t_1 and t_2 . Namely the circumstance that the magnetic moments are close to the instability line make them very sensitive to changes of the NNN hoppings. Indeed, which of solutions, magnetic or non-magnetic, will arise, is controlled by the value of hopping integral t_3 : $t_3^C(Fe-Fe) = -0.75$ leads to formation of the paramagnetic state in the alloy **C**, whereas a decrease of t_3 in the alloy **D**, $t_3^D(Fe-Fe) = -0.60$ gives birth to a ferromagnetic state in the alloy **D**. The increase of $|t_3^C(Fe-Fe)|$ compared to $|t_3^D(Fe-Fe)|$ occurs due to shorter distance between Fe atoms in the NNN environment in alloy **C** (Table III). Moreover, a decrease of $|t_3|$ results in appearance of magnetic moments on both Fe atoms in the alloy **C**; at $t_3^C = 0.0$ the map of magnetic moments in the alloy **C** becomes similar to one for the alloy **D** (Fig. 4, bottom panel). At first glance one could expect that the formation of the $Fe-Si$ bond should destroy the moment on the Fe atom. However, the magnetic moments on Fe atoms happen to be much less sensitive to the hopping parameter t_2 between NN Fe and Si atoms. Indeed, all the $t_1 - t_2$ -maps for Fe moments, calculated within this model, are elongated along the axis t_2 .

The physics of the destruction of the magnetic moments on Fe atoms can be interpreted from the point of view of the d -band formation. The Fig. 5 illustrates this for the alloy **C** via the evolution of the Fe_I d -electron pDOS and corresponding magnetic-moment maps with the increasing of only hopping integral t_3 at all other hopping integrals kept fixed. As seen, at first steps of increase of t_3 a gradual smearing of initially (at $t_3 = 0$) atom-like levels and a slight change of the map of magnetic moments occurs. Then, similar to the case of $\alpha - FeSi_2$, at




Figure 5. (Color online) The alloy **C**: Model pDOS (left panel) and the map of the magnetic moments (right panel) for the different values of hopping integral $t_3(Fe-Fe)$. The blue lines at the last map show the values of hopping integrals $t_1 = 0.9$ and $t_2 = 1.0$ (Table III), which provide the best fitting to the *ab initio* charge density.

$t_3 = -0.75$ the abrupt destruction of the magnetic moments arises and the difference between the minority and majority spin states in pDOS disappears.

Let us now discuss the origin of the unusual ferri-magnetic state in the type of the alloy **B** (Table I), which contains three substitutional Fe atoms on the Si sites. The ordered alloy **B** has the tetragonal lattice with space group $P4mm$. There are three non-equivalent Fe atoms in the unit cell: Fe_0 is the host iron sublattice of $\alpha - FeSi_2$, Fe_I and Fe_{II} are the non-equivalent substitutional Fe atoms in the Si sublattice. In accordance with *ab initio* calculations, the absolute values of magnetic moments on Fe_I and Fe_{II} atoms are close to each other, but have opposite directions: $\mu(Fe_I) = 2.3\mu_B$, $\mu(Fe_{II}) = -1.9\mu_B$. The model MMs obtained for the values of hopping integrals from Table III are $\mu^{mod}(Fe_I) = 2.8\mu_B$, $\mu^{mod}(Fe_{II}) = -2.1\mu_B$, and $\mu^{mod}(Fe_0) = 0.7\mu_B$. The specific feature of Fe -pDOS in the alloy **B** is that the Fe_{II} -pDOS is mirror-symmetric




Figure 6. (*Color online*) The comparison of the *ab initio* (blue lines) and the model (black lines) pDOS of Fe_I d -electrons (left panel) and Fe_{II} d -electrons (right panel) in the alloy **B**. Top: t_{2g} -electrons, bottom: e_g -electrons

to the pDOS of Fe_I atoms. This feature arises in both first-principle and model calculation. The comparison of

Thus, our analysis of the Hartree-Fock solutions of the multiorbital models of iron silicides and supporting them first-principle calculations allow to conclude that the decisive role in the destruction/formation of the iron magnetic moments is played by the NNN local environment or, more specifically, by the number of neighbors $Fe-Fe$ and the by spacing between them. The results of our calculations show that the previous statement [21]-[23], that the destruction of magnetic moments in the iron silicides is caused by the increase of Si atoms in the NN environment is inaccurate. The obtained in our calculations strong influence of NNN $Fe-Fe$ couples is caused by the peculiarity of the $\alpha-FeSi_2$ crystal structure, where the iron atoms form planes. Since NNN $Fe-Fe$ are arranged along crystallographic axes, the strong σ -bonds between Fe atoms are formed. So in the alloy **C** and $\alpha-FeSi_2$ which contains the iron (001) planes with the shorter distance between $Fe-Fe$ than in the alloy **D**, these d -bonds result in the delocalization of the electrons and a decrease of the MMs up till their destruction (Fig.5). At the same time in the alloys **C** and **D** Fe atoms have the same number of Si atoms in the NN environment and this does not prohibit them to have different MMs. It is very instructive to have a look from this point of view at the MM formation in the alloy **A** where the substitutional Fe atoms have maximal MMs compared to the ones in all other alloys considered here. The NNN

pDOSes for substitutional Fe atoms is shown in Fig. 6. As in previous cases we built the t_1-t_2 -maps of MMs for three non-equivalent Fe atoms (Fig. 7). The bright illustration of the importance of NNN interactions is that in spite of the fact that the NN local environment of substitutional Fe atoms is the same (Fig. 7, first column), they have completely different maps of magnetic moments. There is a wide range (at $|t_1| \gtrsim 0.5$) of the negative MMs in the map for Fe_{II} atom (Fig. 7, bottom panel, middle column) with the sharp boundary between positive and negative values of MMs, whereas in the same region of Fe_I t_1-t_2 -map the MM remains positive. These distinctions occur due to different number of Fe atoms in the NNN environment. Indeed, switching off the hoppings between NNN neighbors (t_3 and t_4) changes the behavior of magnetic moments on Fe_{II} atom: the region with the negative moment disappears and the maps for Fe_I and Fe_{II} atoms became almost identical (cf. middle and bottom panel of Fig. 7, last column). This numeric experiment explicitly shows that the role played by the NNN local environment is critically essential for the emergence of the Fe atoms with the opposite MMs and, correspondingly, for the development of the ferri-magnetic state.

environment of the substitutional Fe_I atom in the alloy **A** (Table I, first column) consists of only Si atoms; the hoppings between $Fe-Fe$ which are responsible for the destruction of moment are absent. This facts lead to the formation of a large value of MM on this iron atom.

In order to demonstrate the decisive role of the $d-d$ hopping integral t_3 between NNN $Fe-Fe$ on the formation of the MM on Fe atoms we calculate the dependence of Fe MM on this hopping for $\alpha-FeSi_2$ and the alloys **C** and **B**. This dependence is shown at Fig. 8. As seen, the increase of t_3 in the alloy **C** and in $\alpha-FeSi_2$ causes a destruction of the Fe MMs, whereas in the alloy **B** the abrupt flip of the Fe_{II} magnetic moment is occurred with an increase t_3 . The model results are confirmed by the *ab initio* calculations. Obviously, the hopping integral t_3 changes its value with an increase of the spacing between NNN $Fe-Fe$. Since the integral of the hopping matrix element contains an overlap of the wave functions, we assume that it depends on the distance R between the ions exponentially,

$$t_3(R) = t_3^{max} \exp(\gamma \Delta R), \quad (3)$$

where $t_3^{max} = t_3(R_{min})$ and $\Delta R = R - R_{min}(\text{\AA})$. Taking the values $t_3^{max} = -0.75$ and $R_{min} = 2.53$ from Table III we have found the parameter $\gamma = -0.8926(\text{\AA}^{-1})$.




Figure 7. (Color online) The alloy B. *Top panel, left:* NN and NNN environment of Fe_0 atom; color encodings: Si are blue, Fe_0 are grey, substitutional Fe_I and Fe_{II} are black and green balls correspondingly; *Top panel, center:* the dependence of Fe_0 MM on hopping integrals t_1 and t_2 (hopping integrals t_3 and t_4 are switched on); *Top panel, right:* the dependence of MM on Fe_0 atom on the hopping integrals t_1 and t_2 (hopping integrals t_3 and t_4 are switched off). *Middle and bottom panels:* the same for Fe_I and Fe_{II} atoms, correspondingly. Blue lines on the maps show the values of hopping integrals $t_1 = 0.9$ and $t_2 = 0.95$ (Table III), which provide the best fitting to the *ab initio* charge density.

Using Eq.(3) we obtained the distances R between NNN $Fe-Fe$ corresponding to the model parameters t_3 . Then the values of the MM for the lattice parameters? corresponding to these distances have been calculated within GGA-to-DFT. These values are shown in Fig. 8 by dots. Remarkably, although the only t_3 hopping was changed with the distance R in the model calculations (the values of the other hopping parameters were kept fixed according to Table III) we obtained the good agreement between the model and the *ab initio* magnetic moments. This again proves the significance of the NNN $Fe-Fe$ couplings for the MM formation.

C. *Ab initio* calculation of the Si-rich alloys.

Our model calculations lead to the conclusion that the Fe local MM formation is controlled either by a decrease

of the number of $Fe-Fe$ couples in Fe layers or by an increase of the distance between Fe atoms in pairs. Moreover, we can state that the increase of the cell's magnetic moment with increase of x in Fe -rich alloys $Fe_{1+x}Si_{2-x}$ is associated namely with the appearance of high-spin Fe species in the Si layers, which are surrounded mainly by the Si atoms. However, these conditions can be fulfilled also by an increase of the Si concentration. To make sure that this unexpected conclusion derived from the model is correct we carried out the *ab initio* GGA calculation of Fe magnetic moments for the Si -rich ordered alloys $Fe_{1-x}Si_{2+x}$. The alloy's structures must satisfy the conditions listed above. By adding Si atoms into the iron planes we can decrease the number of the $Fe-Fe$ couples. Besides, the substitutional Si atoms increase the spacing between the Fe atoms.




Figure 8. (Color online) The dependence of MMs on the host Fe_0 and the substitutional Fe_I and Fe_{II} atoms on hopping t_3 in $\alpha - FeSi_2$, the alloys **C** and **B** (from left to right). The solid lines are the dependences, obtained in model calculations, the dots show the MMs from *ab initio* calculations at the distance R between NNN Fe-Fe, according to (3). The scale for the distances (in Å) is given on the tops of the figures.




Figure 9. (Color online) Different environments for Fe ions leads to the formation of local MMs when a part of Fe ions are replaced by Si ions (the host Si atoms are not shown). The optimized lattice parameters and the calculated MMs of the Fe atoms are given under the structures.

Fig. 9 displays three different variants of substitution of Fe atoms in the Fe planes by the Si atoms. All calculations were carried out for the supercells $2a \times 2b \times 2c$ of $\alpha - FeSi_2$, containing six iron atoms and two additional Si atoms. After full optimization of the supercells all considered alloys become magnetic, but the magnitude of the magnetic moment μ per supercell depends on the particular arrangement of substitutional Si atoms: $\mu = 3.2 \mu_B$ (Fig. 9a), $\mu = 3.1 \mu_B$ (Fig. 9b), and $\mu = 1.7 \mu_B$ (Fig. 9c). The emergence of local MM on different Fe atoms in the first two alloys (Fig. 9a,b) corresponds to the expectations, derived from the model. Indeed, since the number of iron NNN surrounded Fe_3 atom in the first alloy (Fig. 9a) is decreased by two, the local magnetic moment $\mu(Fe_3) = 0.8 \mu_B$ on the Fe_3 atom arises. Similar local MM appears on the Fe_1 and the Fe_5 atoms in

the second alloy (Fig. 9b) due to an increase of the distance between NNN $Fe - Fe$ till $\simeq 2.8 \text{ \AA}$. The third alloy (Fig. 9c), however, presents an example where, it seems, the model is oversimplified: the GGA calculation produces zero moment on the Fe_5 atom without Fe atoms in NNN surrounding, while according to our model the biggest local magnetic moment have to arise on the Fe_5 in this case. We assume that the term responsible for it and which is missed in our model is the crystal electric field (CEF), created by the Si surrounding. The Fe_5 in the third alloy (Fig. 9c) sits in the most symmetrical local surrounding $P4/mmm$ by Si atoms, where the CEF splitting has to be stronger than in the first two cases (Fig. 9a, b).

The statement that the magnetic moments in $Fe - Si$ alloys can arise due to an increase of the Si concentra-

tion allows us to suggest an alternative explanation of the ferromagnetism in the $\alpha - FeSi_2(111)$ film on $Si(001)$ substrate, successfully stabilized by the authors of [19]. The authors of Ref.[19] explain the ferromagnetism of the $\alpha - FeSi_2$ film by the small concentration (about 3%) of the additional substitutional Fe atoms. The calculation in [19] were performed in the framework of CPA, which is not able to take into account the local-environment effects. We assume that the observed moment arises not due to an increase of the Fe concentration as stated in the work [19], but due to an increase of Si concentration that arises due to a diffusion of the Si atoms from the Si substrate. For example, the lattice parameters in the considered here Si -rich alloys are such that the (111) elementary-cells sizes of the $\alpha - FeSi_2$ are very close to the $Si(001) - (3 \times 2)(11.5 \times 7.68 \text{\AA})$: $(11.83 \times 7.89 \text{\AA})$, $(11.76 \times 7.83 \text{\AA})$, $(11.67 \times 7.93 \text{\AA})$ for the first (Fig. 9a), second (Fig. 9b) and third (Fig.9c) alloys, correspondingly. This corresponds to the mismatch about (-1.5%) - (-2.5%) . Such a low mismatch presents an opportunity to stabilize the epitaxial films of the $\alpha - FeSi_2$ structure with similar arrangements of Si atoms. The magnetic moment $\mu \approx 0.2 - -0.4 \mu_B/f.u.$ arises for all types of the substitutions shown in Fig. 9, which is consistent with the observed in Ref.[19] values.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

Today it is recognized, that the large, if not the decisive, role in the mechanism of the magnetic structure formation in different compounds is played by the local environment of the magnetic species. However, most of *ab initio* codes, based on DFT, are complicated and usually represents a “black box”, impedes the physical interpretation of the results. In particularly, it is difficult to extract the contributions from different local environment of an atom. Effects of local environment are especially important in alloys, in which the slight difference in the local environment can result in significantly different magnetic structures. The substitutionally disordered systems such as metallic alloys play an increasingly important role in technological applications and, hence, a lot of efforts are invested into a theoretical understanding of their properties. Although CPA is nowadays the most successful *ab initio* theory for the calculations of disordered alloys, the standard formulation of it neglects the effects of NNN environment. Along with the development of the *ab initio* methods (as non local CPA[37]), the understanding of the certain property of the specific compound can be reached in the framework of the suitable models with the parameters obtained from the *ab initio* calculations for a given compound. Namely such combination of the *ab initio* calculations with the multiorbital model one for the iron silicides was used in our work. The feature which distinguishes our model approach from other ones is that the parameters of the model are determined from the fitting its self-consistent charge density to the one, obtained by

ab initio calculations. This allows to study the effects of NN and NNN local environment of the Fe atoms on the MM formation.

The presented study of the effect of silicon-atoms’ substitution by the iron atoms and *vice versa* on the magnetic properties in the iron silicide $\alpha - FeSi_2$ within the suggested multiorbital model has shown that while the stoichiometric material $\alpha - FeSi_2$ is nonmagnetic, the appearance of substitutional iron atoms in the $\alpha - FeSi_2$ may result in different magnetic structures, either ferromagnetic or ferrimagnetic. Which particular structure emerges is determined by the number and the *spatial arrangement* of the substitutional iron atoms. The latter statement is strongly supported by the fact that different magnetic structures can appear at *the same* concentration of substitutional Fe atoms. Besides, as follows from the Hartree-Fock model calculations, the MMs formation is essentially determined not by the NN Si atoms but by the NNN environment, particularly, by the Fe atoms along the crystallographic axes: the MMs on iron atoms are very sensitive to the values of NNN $Fe - Fe$ hopping parameters t_3 . We demonstrated it by a comparison of the maps of moments dependence on the hopping parameters with and without taking into account NNN ones. It is important that the nonmagnetic states in the stoichiometric $\alpha - FeSi_2$ arise at NNN $t_3 \neq 0$ only. The model with NN hoppings only, even if all NN to Fe atoms are Si atoms, does not have the solutions with zero moments on Fe . This allows to suggest that the magnetism in the nonmagnetic $\alpha - FeSi_2$ can be induced by a negative pressure.

The various magnetic structures (ferro-, ferri- or non-magnetic) in Fe -rich alloys also controlled by the NNN $Fe - Fe$ hopping parameters t_3 . The different ways of Si atoms substitution by Fe atoms result in the diverse local distortions of the underlying lattice and, in turn, to quite different hopping parameters t_3 and magnetic properties. It is most clearly demonstrated by the magnetic behavior of several alloys with the same concentration of substitutional atoms, *e.g.*, alloys **C** and **D** considered in this work (Sec.IIB). The comparison of the magnetic-moments maps reveals that different values of NNN $Fe - Fe$ hopping parameters t_3 lead to the diverse magnetic behaviour: a nonmagnetic one in the alloy **C** and a ferromagnetic one in the alloy **D**. Notice, despite of the different lattice distortion, the spacing between NN (as well as number of NN Si atoms) is the same in the both cases, hence, the local environment models which do not take into account the NNN hoppings, cannot explain this distinction. Unlike the local environment models [21, 22] we observe a weak dependence of the Fe magnetic moment on the hopping t_2 between NN Fe and Si atoms: all the $t_1 - t_2$ -maps for Fe moments, calculated within this model, are elongated along the axis t_2 . One more characteristic feature of these maps is the presence of sharp boundaries between magnetic states region and nonmagnetic one as a function of NN $Fe - Fe$ hopping integral t_1 . In general, our conclusion about the decisive

role of NNN local environment in the magnetic moment formation contradicts to the conclusions of earlier (much less detailed) models of local environment, where a decrease of the moment on Fe atoms was ascribed to the increase of number of Si in NN sphere. According to our calculations the main role in formation of local magnetic moment is played by decreasing of the number of $Fe-Fe$ pairs along the crystallographic axes and/or increasing of the distance between them. This conclusion is especially interesting since most of models do not take the NNN hoppings into account.

The unexpected and somewhat counter-intuitive conclusion, produced by the model calculations, is that not only an increase of the Fe concentration can lead to the emergence of local magnetic moment on Fe atoms, but also of the metalloid concentration. Indeed, the number of the $Fe-Fe$ pairs can be reduced by replacing of the Fe atoms in iron planes by Si atoms. Moreover the distances between Fe atoms in these planes are increased due to the distortion of the underlying lattice. So, the conditions leading to the emergence of magnetism are met. The *ab initio* calculation of the ordered Si -rich alloys confirms this conclusion. Hence we can explain the ferromagnetism in the $\alpha-FeSi_2(111)$ film, obtained by the authors of Ref.[19], in a more realistic way. In our opinion, the observed in Ref.[19] moment results from the increase of Si concentration due to a diffusion of the Si atoms from the Si substrate, but not due to an increase of the Fe concentration.

Based on the presented analysis, we can formulate the conditions promoting the appearance of a magnetism in the iron silicides. The key parameters responsible for the magnetism are the hoppings between Fe atoms t_1 and t_3 , which are the most sensitive parameters to different

types of pressure. The latter can be done by either by fitting the lattice parameter of the substrate for $\alpha-FeSi_2$ film (chemical pressure), or by a substitution of Fe or Si atoms. As was pointed out in Ref.[20], the best orientation relationships, that stabilize the epitaxial $\alpha-FeSi_2$ are $\alpha-FeSi_2(201)||Si(110)$, $\alpha-FeSi_2(110)||Si(110)$ or $\alpha-FeSi_2(111)||Si(001)$. Such planes contain additional Si atoms in Si -rich alloys from Fig. 9 and the sizes of corresponding unit cells are very close to the Si -substrate one. Small mismatch has place for the all mutual orientations of film and substrate and presents an opportunity to stabilize the epitaxial films of the $\alpha-FeSi_2$ structure. Moreover the possibility of tuning the hopping parameter t_3 in iron silicides has the large technological interest, because it gives an opportunity to control the appearance of different magnetic configurations in the cause of fabrication of new alloys or nanostructures with the prospective magnetic properties. At last, the existence of the region with sharp transition from ferro- to paramagnetic or from ferro- to ferrimagnetic state strongly improves the perspectives of the practical applications of iron silicide films and, hopefully, will stimulate technologists to find a way to make the films near the instability line with desirable characteristics.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by the Russian Foundation for Basic Research, projects No 14-02-00186, 17-02-00161 and by the joint Krasnoyarsk regional scientific foundation and Russian Foundation for Basic Research, projects No 16-42-242036, 16-42-243035. The authors would like to thank AS Shinkorenko for the technical support.

-
- [1] A.I. Liechtenstein, M.I. Katsnelson, and V.A. Gubanov, J. Phys. F 14, L125 (1984); Solid State Commun. 54, 327, (1985); A.I.Liechtenstein, M.I. Katsnelson, V.P. Antropov, and V.A. Gubanov, J. Magn. Magn. Mater. 67, 65, (1987); M. I. Katsnelson, A. I. Lichtenstein, Phys. Rev. 61, 8906 (2000-I).
 - [2] L. Hedin, Phys. Rev. 139 (3A), A796 (1965).
 - [3] J.C. Slater, G.F.Koster Phys.Rev. 94,1498 (1954)
 - [4] Leong D, Harry M, Reeson K J and Homewood K P, Nature 387 686–8 (1997)
 - [5] Liang S, Islam R, Smith D J, Bennett P A, O'Brien J R and Taylor B, Appl. Phys. Lett. 88 113111 (2006)
 - [6] Kataoka K, Hattori K, Miyatake Y and Daimon H Phys. Rev. B 74 155406 (2006)
 - [7] Seo K, Lee S, Jo Y, Jung M-H, Kim J, Churchill D G and Kim B J. Phys. Chem. C 113 6902–5 (2009)
 - [8] V.A. Niculescu, T.J. Burch, J.I. Budnick, JMMM, 39, 223-267 (1983)
 - [9] S.A. Lyaschenko, Z.I. Popov, S.N. Varnakov, L.A. Kuzubov, S.G. Ovchinnikov, T.S. Shamirzaev, A.V. Latyshev, and A.A. Saranin, JETP 120, 886 (2015)
 - [10] Ionescu A et al Phys.Rev. B 71 094401 (2005)
 - [11] C. Kloc, E. Arushanov, M. Wendl, H. Hohl, U. Malang, and E. Bucher, J. Alloys Compd. 219, 93 (1995).
 - [12] N. Jedrecy, A. Waldhauer, M. Sauvage-Simkin, R. Pinchaux, and Y. Zheng, S, Phys. Rev. B 49, 4725 (1994).
 - [13] J K Tripathi, M Garbrecht, W D Kaplan, G Markovich and I Goldfarb, Nanotechnology 23, 495603 (2012)
 - [14] Dusaosoy Y, Protas J, Wandji R and Roques B Acta Crystallogr. B 27 1209–18 (1971)
 - [15] M. Seibt, R. Khalil, V. Kveder, and W. Schröter, Appl. Phys. A 96, 235 (2009).
 - [16] S. Pan, C. Ye, X. Teng, H. Fan, and G. Li, Phys. Status Solidi A 204, 3316 (2007)
 - [17] X. Lin, M. Behar, J. Desimoni, H. Bernas, J. Washburn, and Z. Liliental - Weber, Appl. Phys. Lett. 63, 105 (1993).
 - [18] C. Detavernier, C. Lavoie, J. Jordan-Sweet, and A. S. Özcan, Phys. Rev. B 69, 174106 (2004).
 - [19] Guixin Cao, D. J. Singh, X.-G. Zhang, German Samolyuk et al, PRL 114, 147202 (2015)
 - [20] J K Tripathi, G Markovich and I Goldfarb, App. Phys. Letters, 251604 (2013)
 - [21] W.A.Hines, A.H.Menotti, J.I.Budnick,T.J.Burch,T.Litrenta,V.Niculescu, K.Ray

- Phys.Rev. B 13, 4060 (1976)
- [22] E P Elsukov, G N Konygin, V A Barinov: and E V Voronina J. Phys.: Condens. Matter 4, 7597 (1992)
 - [23] J.Kudrnovsky, N.E.Christensen, O.K.Andersen Phys.Rev. B 43,5924 (1990)
 - [24] NG Zamkova, VS Zhandun,IS Sandalov, SG Ovchinnikov, arXiv:1607.02856 [cond-mat.mtrl-sci] (2016)
 - [25] I.Khmelevska, S. Khmelevskiy, A.V. Ruban, and P. Mohn, J.Phys.: Cond. Matter, 18, 6677-6689 (2006)
 - [26] N.I. Kulikov, D.Fristot, J.Hugel, A.V. Postnikov, Phys. Rev. B66, 014206 (2002)
 - [27] J. Kanamori Prog. Theor. Phys. 30, 275 (1963)
 - [28] H.J.Monkhorst and J.D.Pack Phys.Rev.B 13,5188 (1976)
 - [29] G.Kresse and J. Furthmuller Comput. Mat. Sci. 6, 15 (1996); G.Kresse and J. Furthmuller Phys. Rev.B 54 11169 (1996)
 - [30] P.E.Bloch Phys. Rev.B 50, 17953 (1994); G.Kresse and D.Joubert Phys. Rev. B 59, 1758 (1999)
 - [31] J.P.Perdew, K.Burke and M.Ernzerhof Phys.Rev.Lett. 77, 3865 (1996); J.P.Perdew, K.Burke and M.Ernzerhof Phys.Rev.Lett. 78, 1396 (1997)
 - [32] P. Villars and L. D. Calvert, Pearson's Handbook of Crystallo-graphic Data for Intermetallic Phases (American Society for Metals, Materials Park, OH, 1985)
 - [33] S. Eisebitt, J.-E. Rubensson, M. Nicodemus, T. Boske, S. Blugel, W. Eberhardt, K. Radermacher, S. Mantl, and G. Bihlmayer, Phys. Rev. B 50, 18330 (1994).
 - [34] R. Girlanda, E. Piparo, and A. Balzarotti, J. Appl. Phys. 76, 2837 (1994)
 - [35] E. G. Moroni, W. Wolf, J. Hafner, and R. Podloucky, Phys. Rev.B 59, 12860 (1999).
 - [36] I. Sandalov, N. Zamkova, V. Zhandun, I. Tarasov et al, Phys. Rev B 92, 205129 (2015)
 - [37] D. A. Rowlands Rep. Prog. Phys. 72, 086501(2009)